

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

ENDC/PV.89
ENDC/PV.89
7 December 1962
ENGLISH

APR 8 1968

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva
on Friday, 7 December 1962, at 4 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. M. TARABANOV

(Bulgaria)

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. ASSUMPCAO de ARAUJO
Mr. FRANK da COSTA

Bulgaria:

Mr. M. TARABANOV
Mr. G. GUELEV
Mr. M. KARASSINECHOV
Mr. V. ISMIRLIEV

Burma:

U TUN SEMIN
U MAUNG MAUNG GTI

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. J.E.G. HARDY
Mr. J.F.M. BELL
Mr. R.M. TAIT

Czechoslovakia

Mr. K. KURKA
Mr. M. ZEMLA
Mr. J. BUCEK
Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia

ATC H. HAMID
ATC M. GHEBEYEHU

India:

Mr. A.S. LALL
Mr. A.S. MEHTA

Italy:

Mr. F. CAVALLETTI
Mr. A. CAVAGLIERI
Mr. C. COSTA-REGGINI
Mr. F. LUCICLI OTTIERI

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

Mexico:

Mr. L. PADILLA MERVIC
Mr. E. CALDERON PUIG
Mr. D. GONZALES GONZALEZ

Nigeria:

Mr. L.C.N. OBI

Poland:

Mr. K. LACHS
Mr. E. STANLEWSKI
Mr. W. WIECZOREK

Romania:

Mr. G. IACOVESCU
Mr. E. GLASER
Mr. H. FLORESCU
Mr. N. ECOBESCU

Sweden:

Baron C.E. von PLATEN
Mr. M. STAHL
Mr. P. KELLIN
Mr. B. FRIEDMAN

Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics:

Mr. S.K. TSARAPKIN
Mr. A.A. ROSECHIN
Mr. I.G. USACHEV
Mr. P.F. SHAKOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. M.H. El-ZAYYAT
Mr. S. AHMED
Mr. H. KASSEM
Mr. S. IBRAHIM

PRESENT AT THE TABLE (Cont'd)

United Kingdom:

Sir Michael WRIGER

Mr. D.N. BRINSON

Mr. R.C. BEETHAM

United States of America:

Mr. A.H. DEAN

Mr. C.C. STELLE

Mr. D.E. MARK

Mr. V. BAKER

Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General

Mr. W. EPSTEIN

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): I declare open the eighty-ninth meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

MR. DEAN (United States of America): Today I have just a few very brief remarks to make on the subject of the ban on nuclear weapon tests in all environments by treaty -- a result which my government sincerely hopes will come about, and soon. At the forty-seventh meeting of the test ban Sub-Committee yesterday, the Soviet representative spoke about a number of so-called alternatives that he was offering to the United States and the United Kingdom as bases for agreement on a nuclear test ban treaty (ENDC/SC.1/PV.47, pp. 15 et seq.). I would like to take this opportunity to emphasize once again that the Soviet Union could have agreement on a nuclear test ban treaty today. Our comprehensive treaty, ENDC/58, is on the table as a Conference document, ready for signature. We are prepared today to sign that treaty, which would ban all tests in all environments for all time. If the Soviet Union will not sign that treaty, which is our preference, we are also prepared to sign our partial treaty, ENDC/59, immediately.

With great respect I submit that the United Kingdom and the United States have made continuous and exhaustive -- and exhausting -- efforts to bring about a constructive agreement on a nuclear test ban treaty. We yield to no one in our desire for such an agreement. Our offer of treaties and our record of research and of constructive suggestions in order to conclude a treaty are available for all to see and to read. We are open minded and we are willing to negotiate concerning the terms of a comprehensive treaty agreement so long as the essential principles of an adequate and effective system of detection stations, with modern instrumentation, and a number of obligatory on-site inspections by the commission, are included in it.

At a recent meeting of the Sub-Committee (ENDC/SC.1/PV.46, p. 28), the Soviet representative spoke of the possibilities of using a number of automatic seismic stations on Soviet territory in lieu of detection stations and obligatory on-site inspection as one basis on which agreement might be reached. The Soviet representative was asked a number of pertinent questions by the United States and United Kingdom representatives about important details of that proposal. Each of those details is, of course, of extreme interest to our governments, because it is only by knowing the details that we will be able to determine exactly what we are agreeing to do.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

However, the Soviet representative has refused to answer any of our questions, and merely continues to repeat the negative and unhelpful statement that we should blindly agree in principle to the Soviet proposal -- whatever that may mean -- and that at some time later all the details could be worked out.

However, after a careful review of the verbatim records, it appears that the Soviet representative is not proposing that we should merely set up a system of automatic seismic stations as a part of the overall control system. That is not the case at all: let us be clear about that. What the Soviet representative is saying is that the United States and the United Kingdom must agree in principle not only to accept some unclear, undefined system of automatic seismic stations to monitor underground weapon tests, without regard to where they might be located and without regard to the equipment in those stations or to how they would function, but also that the United States and the United Kingdom must accept at the same time, completely and unreservedly, the Soviet view that no on-site inspection would be necessary in any circumstances -- perhaps even that no manned detection stations in the Soviet Union would be required. He is saying that the United States and the United Kingdom must abandon their carefully worked out comprehensive treaty -- which they worked out only after the most careful consultation with their scientists.

Of course, our two governments cannot agree to any such blind arrangement. That would mean that they would be taking on an unknown quantity offered by the Soviet Union on a completely unclear basis and, at the same time, unequivocally giving up all that they and the scientists skilled in the field -- and I repeat "scientists skilled in the field", because there are many scientists -- know to be necessary for adequate, effective and scientific control over the cessation of underground nuclear weapon tests.

In our view, the details of any particular agreement on the cessation of underground tests in the work of the commission are of supreme importance, for only through negotiation of the details can we really know that adequate scientific control will be assured. In this connexion, our comprehensive draft test ban treaty presents the full details for negotiation and agreement. For our part, we are not

(Mr. Dean, United States)

offering the Soviet Union some veiled or secret kind of agreement in principle. We have set down all of the details and we are quite ready to agree to them or to negotiate constructively upon them.

In this connexion, I should like to emphasize that we are completely willing to study in a scientific, objective and impartial manner any proposal which the Soviet Union would care to make on automatic seismic stations. Our scientists would be happy to meet the Soviet scientists to discuss how and in what ways automatic seismic stations might most usefully be employed in any control system or what useful purpose they would serve.

I might add that while we are open-minded on the subject of any scientific discussion on the precise usefulness and practicability of these automatic stations, there is no evidence so far available to our scientists, who are skilled in these matters, which indicates that a system of automatic stations could replace completely or substantially a manned network of control stations or could do away with the need for a necessary number of obligatory on-site inspections. Nevertheless, we are ready to study thoroughly and completely any proposal which the Soviet Union would care to make, setting forth in detail what it believes automatic stations should be used for and how it believes these stations can help us in our job of assuring adequate and effective control in the fields of detection, location and identification for the cessation of underground nuclear weapon tests.

I should like to emphasize again that although there has been a great improvement in the field of detection and although there has been improvement in the ability to identify some earthquakes, there has been little or no improvement in the ability to identify underground explosions by instrumentation. Let us not be confused about the state of science with respect to the ability to identify underground explosions by instrumentation. There has been little or no improvement in that field. We are only deluding ourselves when we confuse the improvements in detection with improvements in identification. Our present ability to identify allows us to eliminate certain earthquakes from consideration. But we are a long way from the ability to identify underground explosions.

As to these Pugwash papers, there were some brilliant individual scientists there, but if my information is correct some of the people who signed that paper (ENDC/66) were not seismologists.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

This morning the Soviet representative had some things to say about the Soviet position on on-site inspection (ENDC/PV.88, p. 32 et s.). He referred to the statement made by the representative of the United Kingdom at the eighty-seventh meeting (ENDC/PV.87, pp. 7-8), in which Sir Michael Wright had made it clear that there had once been an agreement between the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union on the need for on-site inspection on the basis of the Soviet draft treaty article introduced at the one hundred and eighth meeting of the Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapon Tests (GEN/DIE/PV.108, p.3). Indeed, as the United Kingdom representative pointed out, in April 1959 Chairman Khrushchev had proposed that there should be a quota of obligatory on-site inspections in the territory of each of the nuclear Powers.

Sir Michael Wright then asked why the Soviet Union had, on 28 November 1961, abandoned this proposal for a number of necessary on-site inspections to assure identification of seismic events. The Soviet representative replied this morning that the scientific situation had changed since 1959 and that great progress has been made. But time and again we have pointed out that in United Kingdom and United States scientific circles we know of no scientific improvements which make it possible to identify by distant instrumentation all seismic events. We have asked the Soviet Union to send its scientists to meet our scientists in order to discuss and explore these improvements which the Soviet Union alleges have been made, to try to reach a satisfactory agreement. But every time we question the Soviet representative on this score he insists that we must take a political decision and that we must take it blindly; so, unfortunately, we are right back again where we started.

It seems to me that the statement of the Soviet representative is just one more proof of the fact that the Soviet Union, for reasons with which I am not familiar, is just not interested in negotiating a test ban agreement stopping all tests in all environments for all time. My view on this matter was reinforced by one other point made by Mr. Tsarapkin at this morning's meeting. While I do not have the precise verbatim record of the statement available to quote from, my recollection is that in the course of his statement he again tried to make the point that the only purpose of the United Nations General Assembly resolution 1762 A (XVII) (ENDC/63), was to institute an uninspected, uncontrolled moratorium

(Mr. Dean, United States)

after 1 January 1963. In this connexion, he seems to have discarded completely all the other provisions of resolution 1762 A (XVII) and, in particular, paragraph 6 and to have discarded completely all of the United Nations General Assembly resolution 1762 B (XVII).

In addition, it becomes even more clear from this morning's meeting that the Soviet Union does not intend to try to comply with paragraph 3 of resolution 1762 A (XVII), which urges that a mutually acceptable comprehensive nuclear test ban be negotiated before 1 January 1963. Many of us in this Committee and many members of the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly have made statements concerning this resolution. On balance, the great majority of statements on this resolution have supported the view that the resolution must be read as a whole -- each inter-related paragraph in conjunction with every other paragraph. That is the standard rule of construction. I think therefore the record is clear on this and that further Soviet attempts to try to raise some priority for paragraph 2 or to make it some higher law are doomed to failure on the basis of the record alone.

Nevertheless, the Soviet representative concluded his statement by saying just exactly what I had predicted at some of our earlier meetings that the Soviet Union would say. He attempted to make paragraph 2 into an uninspected, uncontrolled moratorium, and he demanded to know whether the United States and the United Kingdom would cease tests in accordance with what he alleges to be the request of the General Assembly.

On behalf of the United States delegation, I can give him a clear answer to his question now. The United States will do its level best and will spare no effort to attempt to carry out what it believes to be the purpose and the spirit of parts A and B of resolution 1762 (XVII), but the United States will not accept another uninspected, uncontrolled moratorium on underground tests. Our position on that is clear. We have had a sad and unfortunate experience with such unilateral obligations in the past, even though undertaken by the highest authority in the Soviet Union, and we do not intend to repeat that sad experience.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

It appears that the Soviet Union has now abandoned all pretence at real negotiations and is trying to bring out some sort of uncontrolled, uninspected moratorium arrangement, instead of the test ban treaty which we all desire, by these attempts to pervert the plain and clear meaning of resolution 1762 A (XVII).

In further reply to the Soviet representative's question, I should like to ask him a question. Is the Soviet Union prepared now to enter into meaningful negotiations to comply with either paragraphs 3 or 6 of resolution 1762 A (XVII) so that by 1 January 1963 we may reach an effective and workable arrangement on a cessation of all tests? My delegation will await with the utmost interest the Soviet representative's reply to that question.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): I do not think there is anyone else who wishes to speak on the cessation of nuclear tests. If so, we shall proceed to the discussion and adoption of our report to the General Assembly on the debates we have held so far concerning nuclear tests.*

If no other member of the Committee wishes to amplify his remarks or exercise his right of reply, I should like, before opening the debate on our report to the General Assembly, to make a few remarks on this morning's discussions in my capacity as representative of Bulgaria.

The representative of Italy elaborated certain questions which other delegations had raised previously. He referred in particular (ENDC/PV.88, p. 20) to the statements made by the Bulgarian delegation on the question of the conclusion of a partial treaty (ENDC/PV.87, pp. 19 et seq.). You will remember that we had quoted numerous statements made by the representatives of the Western Powers to the effect that the conclusion of a partial treaty would be a humanitarian act. The reply to this question was given by the Burmese representative (A/C.1/PV.1249, p.7) which we quoted previously.

This morning the representative of Italy attempted to show that the conclusion of a partial treaty should be regarded as an effort to put an end to nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space, and that this would result in the preservation of humanity from those dangers which are involved in nuclear tests.

* Subsequently circulated as document ENDC/68.

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

We have emphasized again and again that the socialist delegations desire no less than the delegations of the Western Powers to see the cessation of nuclear tests in the three environments I have just mentioned, but we must, of course, be assured that the destruction of all humanity is not being prepared through the continuation of underground tests. What humanitarian sentiments would be served by agreeing to the cessation of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, while calmly continuing to bring the world nearer to catastrophe?

Is that what the Italian delegation wishes to achieve by the conclusion of a partial treaty on nuclear tests? Do the delegations of the Western Powers desire to prepare for the destruction of humanity, since the continuation of nuclear tests would allow the armaments race to continue? If that is what they desire, they should say so openly, before the whole of mankind. A partial treaty would lead humanity inevitably to a catastrophe, as several delegations have emphasized today.

Moreover, in referring to certain suggestions made by the non-aligned delegations, the representative of Italy drew attention to the attitude of the Soviet Union. If the Soviet Union rejects the recent proposals of the non-aligned delegations, how can that be reconciled with the support it has repeatedly expressed for the eight-nation memorandum (ENDC/28)? That, I believe, is the point which the Italian representative wished to make, and I notice he is nodding his head significantly.

Today the non-aligned nations stated (ENDC/PV.88, p. 5), in substance, in connexion with their suggestions, that the remarks made by the neutral delegations during the last few meetings concerning a treaty for the prohibition of nuclear tests were intended as a response to resolution 1762 (XVII) of the General Assembly of the United Nations (ENDC/63). The non-aligned nations have also stated that these suggestions and remarks should not be taken as individual interpretations of the eight-nation memorandum which was unanimously endorsed by the General Assembly.

Consequently the socialist countries have the right not only to emphasize that they are in favour of the eight-nation memorandum, but also to ask what is the precise position of the Western Powers and why they do not accept this memorandum as a basis for negotiations on the cessation of nuclear tests. As regards the Italian delegation, I think it should at least take into account the statements

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

made this morning, and not tell us that the suggestions of the non-aligned States were made in the context of the eight-nation memorandum or represent interpretation of the latter. That is all that I wish to say concerning the two remarks made this morning by the Italian delegation.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): Mr. Chairman, I only wish to ask you whether you consider that the proposals which I mentioned this morning, and which were put forward by the non-aligned delegations, are outside the framework of, or in contradiction with the memorandum which was presented by these same delegations.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): If no one else wishes to speak I shall reply in one sentence to the representative of Italy. I ask him to read the statement which was made this morning on behalf of the eight non-aligned States and he will have the answer.

We shall now proceed to the discussion of the Committee's draft report on the progress of negotiations for the prohibition of nuclear tests, which is to be submitted by 10 December 1962. The two co-Chairmen were able to confer on this question early this afternoon. In connexion with the remarks made this morning by certain non-aligned States, they wish to emphasize that in their view the report to be submitted to the General Assembly should remain in its present form as a draft drawn up by the two co-Chairmen. This, at least, is what I understand was decided by the two co-Chairmen. Has anyone any remarks or observations to make on this question?

Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): Since I formally asked the co-Chairmen this morning on behalf of the eight delegations to include in their draft report a summary of the suggestions and comments made by each of these delegations (ENDC/PV.88, p.5), we obviously do not agree that the report should consist exclusively of this letter. We should therefore like to have the opinion of the co-Chairmen on the proposal I made this morning on behalf of the eight delegations.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): Does anyone else wish to speak on this question? Have the co-Chairmen any comments to make on the Mexican representative's remarks?

Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): The situation is very strange. It seems that this letter is to be sent to the General Assembly as a report from this Committee. The Chairman has asked whether anyone wishes to comment on the remarks made in this draft report. I have said that there are some comments to be made, that eight delegations do not agree with this report because it does not contain enough. We have asked that the report should include the observations which have been distributed. So there is no agreement on this report.

If the co-Chairmen refuse to give an opinion on the request we have made, the report is not approved, and I ask for the United Nations General Assembly to be informed that no report has been made on what has happened here. What has happened here is in the records. We have received no reply from the co-Chairmen as to whether or not they agree, or why they do not agree, to the inclusion in the report of this summary of our observations. I think we have the right -- everybody has the right -- to know what the co-Chairmen think of these observations which have been put forward on behalf of eight delegations to this Committee.

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): In response to the remarks that have just been made by the representative of Mexico, I believe that the Chairman of this meeting has accurately set forth the agreed recommendations of the two co-Chairmen that the report should be left without addition. These are our reasons. Operative paragraph 7 of resolution 1762 A (XVII):

"Requests the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament

... to report to the General Assembly by 10 December 1962 ..." (ENDC/63)

The report constitutes the Committee's response to the General Assembly's request; and, as you will notice, the provisional verbatim records of the six plenary and three Sub-Committee meetings are enclosed. It is the understanding of the two co-Chairmen, subject to correction, that certain summaries of remarks, which already appear in the verbatim records which are to be transmitted, were proposed to be added.

(Mr. Dean, United States)

After careful consideration, it did not seem to us to be proper parliamentary procedure to submit summaries of a portion of a provisional verbatim record without summarizing the entire verbatim record. It seemed to us that that procedure would involve us in a great deal of time and work, and that this, therefore, would not be necessary to permit us to approve the report to the United Nations General Assembly by this afternoon. But of course the Committee is the judge of its own procedures, and the report is simply the recommendation of the two co-Chairmen.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): A short while ago our Chairman informed the Committee of the opinion of the co-Chairmen. Therefore I do not quite understand the question raised by the representative of Mexico to the effect that the Committee would like to know the opinion of the co-Chairmen. It has already been brought to the knowledge of the Committee.

We based ourselves on the view that if the report is to be submitted by 10 December, we should draft it according to the pattern of previous reports of the Committee, that is it should be purely formal. You are aware that there are various points of view and various approaches. There are points of view which are widely divergent. Moreover, some of them are based on the eight-nation memorandum, while others depart from this memorandum and develop their proposals in accordance with certain paragraphs in resolution 1762 (XVII), on which there was no unanimous decision. Others again are based on their own proposals which do not correspond to either document. Consequently, if we start politicizing our report, it will be necessary to reflect in it other, sometimes opposite points of view, for which, of course, there would have to be consultations with governments regarding the precise wording to be included in the report. This would require additional time, possibly a week or more. Therefore it seemed to us that the most reasonable course would be to leave the report in the purely formal terms in which we drafted it. This is how we have acted up till now.

We have followed such a purely formal procedure in previous reports. Of course, I am entirely in agreement with my co-Chairman that the Committee is master of its own procedure and the question can be settled differently.

Those at any rate are the considerations which prompted us to recommend to the Committee that the report should be left in this purely formal wording.

MR. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): That our co-Chairmen have just said amounts to a negative answer, which should be included in today's record. Their reply is that they do not consider that the report should contain the observations -- the summary of the suggestions -- which each of the non-aligned delegations has made.

The argument that it would be necessary to summarize the 400 pages of the verbatim records of these sessions does not seem to me convincing, because it is not the Conference which is making a possibly inaccurate summary of what the other delegations have said, but each of the delegations which has summarized its own statements regarding the suggestions made in the last few days about the cessation of nuclear tests. We are well aware that the records which are being sent to the Assembly include among other things the suggestions we want to summarize. Hence the request we are making applies to nothing new which is not already contained in the records. But we also know that when they reach the United Nations these records amounting probably to some 400 pages will have to be translated and circulated to the 110 Members. Obviously it will be difficult for them to read all these documents. Our object -- and I think I am correctly interpreting the views of my colleagues who entrusted me with this mission this morning -- was to emphasize some points in the report so that it should have some substance.

The Soviet Union representative says that this is the procedure we have followed in the past. But in the past we have made no attempt to provide a substantial report; we have only transmitted records with a statement that we have unfortunately been unable to make any progress.

The representative of the United Arab Republic indicated this morning (ENDC/PV.88, p.44) another method which might be acceptable, and said he saw no reason why the co-Chairmen should not accept it. The observations and suggestions made by the delegations of the non-aligned countries might be circulated as an ENDC document and annexed to the letter which the co-Chairmen will forward by way of report to the President of the General Assembly, Sir Zafullah Khan, in pursuance of paragraph 7 resolution 1762 A (XVII). This might be a solution which the co-Chairmen could accept. In this case the

(Mr. Padilla Nervo, Mexico)

letter would remain as they have drafted it, and it would simply be mentioned that at the request of the eight delegations, the suggestions which they wish to make and which they have themselves drafted are being sent as an annex to this letter.

Of course, we do not imagine that the co-Chairmen are trying to prevent our delegations to the Assembly or the Assembly itself from hearing of our suggestions before they recess, since each of us could send a summary to his delegation in New York and ask to have it read out at a plenary session so that it should appear in the record of the General Assembly as evidence of the effort made by our eight delegations to bring about an agreement.

Hence, if the co-Chairmen are also unwilling to accept the suggestion made this morning by the representative of the United Arab Republic, I ask that it should be mentioned in the record that the co-Chairmen have refused to bring to the notice of the Assembly in this special way the observations which have been made with the best intentions by the non-aligned countries, and which constitute part of the last few days' debates in this Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): I cannot agree with the assessment which has been put before the Committee by the representative of Mexico, Mr. Padilla Nervo.

We have in fact never denied, we are not denying and we have no intention of denying the lawfulness of the request of other delegations that their viewpoint and opinions should be put forward and reflected in the documents which are to be transmitted with the report to the General Assembly in accordance with the resolution which was adopted. The point is only that these viewpoints are in fact already reflected in the documents which are being sent to the General Assembly, namely, in the verbatim records of the meetings.

(Mr. Tsarapkin, USSR)

We think you are aware of our viewpoint which we have already explained and which is that we are not entirely in agreement with everything that has been stated here by representatives of the non-aligned States. If you emphasize your own point of view and have it attached to the report, then obviously other delegations who hold a different point of view also have the same right to emphasize this especially and to have it attached to the report for transmission to the Assembly. But this would require time, because we all intended that the report should be of a formal nature. Preparations would have to be made by all delegations who wish to present their views in the same way as you wish to do. This of course would require additional time. But I must emphasize again that we have never denied and do not deny the legitimate right of every delegation to ask that its views should be put forward in the documents which are transmitted to the Assembly. We have never disputed this right, and I would request the representative of Mexico not to think that what he has just said is so.

Mr. BURNS (Canada): I wonder whether this difficulty could be solved in accordance with the suggestion made this morning, as I understand it, by the representative of the United Arab Republic: by a request of the eight non-aligned nations that the document they produced this morning, setting forth their suggestions which were intended to try to find ways in which resolution 1762 (XVII) could be implemented and agreement could be reached, might be submitted as a conference document and accepted as such and forwarded by the co-Chairmen with their report.

The argument that these summaries are material which is already included in the verbatim records which are to be forwarded does not seem to me to be a very good one. I say this because, first, as mentioned already by the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Mexico, all of us who have had experience at the United Nations know that to reproduce the volume of material that is in these verbatim records will take a considerable time, and it is not likely to be available to all delegations in the General Assembly or its First Committee before the conclusion of the present session. Therefore the representatives in New York who

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

will presumably be discussing this report and taking note of it will not have the opportunity of seeing the valuable suggestions -- at least the Canadian delegation considers them valuable suggestions -- which have been put forward by the eight non-aligned members.

Another reason is this. We have had the joint memorandum (ENDC/28) of the eight nations of 16 April 1962. This has been praised, I think, by a very large number of delegations during the debate in the First Committee and it has been highly eulogized by many delegations here. That was forwarded as a conference document with our report. If these documents which were put forward for our information with the request that they be forwarded with the report are treated as a conference document of this Committee at this time, the Canadian delegation can see no reason why they should not go forward with our report. Of course, if any other delegations feel that they need to add their comments, it seems to me that, by making their statements and asking that they be treated in the same way, they could receive the same treatment.

I should like to defend the proposal that has been made to the effect that these suggestions should go forward. Unfortunately, we have reached no agreement, but that is not for the lack of useful suggestions put forward by the eight nations in an effort to find agreement. I think that these suggestions should go forward with the report. I should like to hear the views of others concerning whether these papers submitted this morning could not be considered a conference document and be treated in the way suggested, following on the suggestion made, I believe, by the representatives of the United Arab Republic and Mexico.

Mr. CAVALLETTI (Italy) (translation from French): I think the main thing the non-aligned delegations desire is that a summary of their ideas should be transmitted to the General Assembly. I wonder why this suggestion meets with so many difficulties and whether quite a simple solution to the problem could not be found. The delegations in question have distributed copies of their statements to each delegation here. It would be sufficient for each delegation to read out its own statement in order that they should appear in the verbatim record for today.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): We have heard the Italian representative's suggestion that the summaries which the non-aligned delegations have drawn up should be included in the verbatim record of this meeting and sent in this form to the General Assembly, together with the other verbatim records which will be presented to it at the same time as the report.

Baron von FLATEN (Sweden): We are now confronted with four different proposals. First, there is the proposal made originally on behalf of the eight nations by the representative of Mexico; then we have the proposal from the United Arab Republic; and then we have the Canadian version and, finally, the Italian version. First of all, I should like to ask the Secretariat whether, from the point of view of United Nations procedure, precedent and rules, there is any difficulty in adopting any one of these four proposals.

My second question is this. I would ask the co-Chairmen kindly to consider the possibility of accepting first of all, if possible, after reconsideration, either the Mexican proposal or the proposal made by the United Arab Republic; or, if neither of those is possible, then the Canadian version. I understand it may perhaps be useful for the two co-Chairmen to consult, and I wonder if it would be agreeable to the Conference to have a recess of fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): Are there any other suggestions or proposals concerning this matter?

Sir Michael WRIGHT (United Kingdom): I support the representative of Sweden.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): We have before us the Swedish representative's proposal, seconded by the United Kingdom representative, that we should suspend this meeting for fifteen minutes, so that the co-Chairmen may confer on the different proposals which have been made and give us a more definite opinion on the situation in which we find ourselves at present. Moreover, if during

(The Chairman, Bulgaria)

this time the Secretariat is able to prepare some answers -- always supposing that answers are available -- to those questions which have been raised by the Swedish representative, we should be in a better position to continue our discussion.

Are there any objections to this proposal? As there are none, the meeting will be suspended for fifteen minutes.

The meeting was suspended at 5.5 p.m. and resumed at 5.25 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): As a result of their consultations the co-Chairmen have agreed to make certain alterations in the text of the draft report to the General Assembly of the United Nations. These alterations concern the last part of the report. I shall read the whole of this last paragraph in order to show you what the differences are, and I shall then re-read the amended portions. I shall read you the English text which is the only one we have at our disposal.

(Continued in English)

"The provisional verbatim records of the above mentioned six plenary and three sub-committee meetings are enclosed as Addendum 1 with this report for the information of the Secretary-General and of the delegations of members of the General Assembly as to the nature of recent developments at the Conference. At the request of certain delegations, certain precisions of their position, as they themselves have prepared them without any comment thereon by the Committee, are attached as Addendum 2 to this report. The Committee will, of course, keep both the General Assembly and the Secretary-General of the United Nations fully informed of future efforts at the Conference devoted to achieving agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapon tests."

The additions are therefore as follows:

The words "as Addendum 1" and the whole of the sentence beginning "At the request of certain delegations" and ending with "as Addendum 2 to this report". I think that this shows that the suggestions made here concerning this question have been accepted by the co-Chairmen and that we can now consult the Committee in order to find out the opinions of the delegations.

Are there any comments on the report as revised by the co-Chairmen?

Mr. LALL (India): I should like to thank the co-Chairmen for having met our point of view, and I think that this resolves the issue. I would request you, Mr. Chairman, to be so good as to read out again the new sentence beginning "At the request of certain delegations". If you will read that slowly, we will take it down.

I am glad to see that this matter has been resolved so amicably, and we take this as an indication that not only can the co-Chairmen agree with each other, which we were finding that they were doing quite often, but they can now agree with other delegations also. Certainly the prospects in our Committee have been improved by what has taken place today.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): At the request of the representative of India, I shall read again the sentence which has been inserted in the draft report at the fifth line after the word "Conference".

"At the request of certain delegations, certain precisions of their position, as they themselves have prepared them without any comment thereon by the Committee, are attached as Addendum 2 to this report."

Mr. PADILLA NERVO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the representative of India and to thank the co-Chairmen for accepting the suggestion of the eight nations. In my view this solves the problem and, more than that, is a proof of how ready our co-Chairmen are to listen to our observations. I again thank the co-Chairmen since I feel that our problem is definitely solved.

Sir Michael WRIGHT (United Kingdom): I also should like to express my appreciation to the co-Chairmen for their efforts, but before expressing a final view upon the form of wording which they have proposed to us there is a question which I should like, if I may, to address to the Secretariat.

The last paragraph of the statement submitted to us says:

"The provisional verbatim records of the above-mentioned 6 plenary and 3 Sub-Committee meetings are enclosed as Addendum 1 with this report for the information of the Secretary-General and of the delegations of members of the General Assembly as to the nature of recent developments at the Conference."

(Sir Michael Wright, United Kingdom)

I should like to ask the Secretariat whether we can be assured that when the report reaches New York, and as soon as it is circulated, sufficient copies of the records of the six plenary and three Sub-Committee meetings which are to be enclosed as Addendum 1 will in fact be available immediately in New York for the information of delegations of Members of the General Assembly, as is stated in the report. It would help me if we could have an assurance from the Secretariat that in fact that will be possible, because, of course, if copies are not available for the information of delegations, the whole purpose of our operation may be frustrated.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): The Swedish representative asked two questions, but I think that in view of the modifications which have been made to the report, these questions are now irrelevant.

I shall now call on the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General to reply to the question asked by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. EPSTEIN (Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General): It is my understanding, too, that the only question that I have to reply to now is that of the representative of the United Kingdom, because the Committee, as is the case always, is master of its own procedures. In the first place, I wonder whether there are six or seven verbatim records of plenary meetings which should be mentioned in the report. My impression is that it should be seven.

In the second place, as soon as we received the draft of this report proposed by the co-Chairmen last night we forwarded to New York by pouch the provisional verbatim records of all meetings up to and including that of Wednesday (ENDC/PV.87). In the normal course of events, taking into account the fact that towards the end of the General Assembly there is a considerable pressure for the reproduction and circulation of documents, it is my estimate, judging from past experience, that it would take about a week, more or less, to reproduce and circulate the provisional verbatim records that have already been pouched. In addition, we shall have to pouch tonight or tomorrow, the records of yesterday's meeting of the Sub-Committee (ENDC/SC.1/PV.47) and of the two plenary meetings of today (ENDC/PV.88, ENDC/PV.89). Those should not take in themselves more than two or three days to reproduce. They should reach New York on Monday, and should be reproduced within two or three days.

(The Deputy Special Representative
of the Secretary-General)

So, answering the question with respect to Addendum 1, the provisional records could, I think, be reproduced and circulated in New York within a period of a week to ten days. As for Addendum 2, since it is very short, it could be reproduced much more rapidly, as could the report itself. They could be reproduced in New York on Monday, if they arrive as I assume they will, by then.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translation from Russian): In the text of the report which is before us I think there is a misprint or, rather, a minor but nevertheless important omission which I think we should correct. The first sentence of page 2 reads:

"The provisional verbatim records of the above-mentioned six plenary and three Sub-Committee meetings are enclosed as Addendum 1 with this report for the information of the Secretary-General ..."

Before the words "Secretary-General" we should add "the General Assembly," after which the wording would be the same, because paragraph 7 of resolution 1762 A (XVII) requests us to report to the General Assembly of the United Nations. We therefore propose this correction so as to comply with paragraph 7.

Sir Michael WRIGHT (United Kingdom): Arising out of the reply of the representative of the Secretary-General, I should like to make the following point.

Speaking on behalf of the United Kingdom, I welcome, and welcome very warmly, the decision that in response to the request of certain delegations precisions of their positions, as they themselves have prepared them, are to be attached as Addendum 2 to the report. I welcome the decision, but I do not think it would be right or that it would give a correct impression of our proceedings if the report were to be circulated in New York either with Addendum 1 and without Addendum 2 or with Addendum 2 and without Addendum 1. I think that would given an unbalanced picture of our proceedings, and before committing myself to saying that I am perfectly happy with the procedure I should like an assurance that the report will be circulated with both addenda together and not with either addendum before or without the other. I hope I have made my point clear to my colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): I should like to sum up the situation. In the first place we have the Soviet delegation's proposal that we should insert in the first sentence of the last paragraph of the report before the words "of the Secretary-General", the words "of the General Assembly", in conformity with the resolution adopted by the General Assembly. This omission is the result of a mistake, and if there are no objections I shall consider this proposal by the Soviet Union adopted.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): Secondly, it has been observed that we should now speak of seven plenary meetings rather than six. If there are no objections, the report will be amended to this effect also.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): Next, the United Kingdom representative has asked that the Secretariat in New York should arrange for the simultaneous distribution of Addenda 1 and 2 in order to avoid errors of interpretation on the part of certain delegations when they read the verbatim reports. I think that the Eighteen-Nation Committee should ask the Secretariat of the United Nations to make every effort to reproduce Addenda 1 and 2 as quickly as possible and to circulate them at the same time as the report of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, so that no errors of interpretation can arise.

As there seem to be no objections to this, we shall request the Secretariat of the United Nations to speed up the duplication and distribution of the documents in question, so that the members of the General Assembly may be informed of all the opinions expressed here, and may be in a position to give us new directives, if possible.

Mr. LALL (India): We have used the word "precisions" in this phrase -- "certain precisions of their position" (supra, p.20). But I am not sure that this is the correct word in English. In this connexion -- I would defer to the two delegations on the other side of the table --, I should have thought we ought to find another word. I suppose what is meant is that at the request of certain delegations, certain précis or summaries -- to use a more common word -- of the position are attached, etc. The word "summaries" would be the more correct word to use; the word "precisions" is not the accurate word in the English language.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): We have before us a proposal that the word "precisions" should be replaced by the word "summaries". Are there any objections to this suggestion, first of all from the co-Chairmen?

Mr. DEAN (United States of America): I have no objection, but I am comparing some of these statements against the verbatim records; I think some of them are almost precisely the same as they are in the verbatim records and they are more "precisions" than they are "summaries", but if the Committee prefers the use of the word "summaries" I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): There seem to be no objections to the use of the word "summaries". These positions have been clarified to some extent precisely because they have been summarized. We shall accordingly use the expression "summaries of their positions" as suggested by the Indian representative.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): I have an announcement to make. The Secretariat tells me that we should say that the report has been adopted. We have done this several times but I think that, officially, we can once more announce that the report as amended has been adopted by the Conference without objection.

The report, as amended, (ENDC/68) was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): The two co-Chairmen have agreed that Monday's meeting should be devoted to items 5 (b) and 5 (c) of the document which has been drawn up by the co-Chairmen (ENDC/52) and which has been adopted by the Conference.

The delegation of Nigeria will, of course, be able to speak, if it wishes, at the beginning of the meeting, or later if it prefers.

It was so decided.

Mr. CBI (Nigeria): I only wish to observe that it is the understanding of my delegation, following my request this morning which the Chairman was kind enough to grant and which met with no objection from any quarter, that the statement and summary to be made by the head of the Nigerian delegation on Monday, 10 December, on the subject of the cessation of nuclear weapon tests will be included as part of the report.

The CHAIRMAN (Bulgaria) (translation from French): The Nigerian representative's remarks are quite understandable. If any other delegation wishes to draw up a summary of its position before Monday, this summary could also be included in the report.

If no one else wishes to speak, we shall pass to the communique.

The Conference decided to issue the following communique:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament this afternoon held its eighty-ninth plenary meeting at the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. Tarabanov, First Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs and representative of Bulgaria.

"Statements were made by representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Italy, Mexico, the Soviet Union, Canada, Sweden, India, the United Arab Republic and Nigeria.

"The Conference adopted a report to the United Nations General Assembly on the question of the cessation of nuclear weapon tests.

"The next plenary meeting of the Conference will be held on Monday, 10 December 1962, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.